

Clark County Schools Advisory Council Meeting Notes

Thursday, December 2, 2021 – 1:00-2:00pm

Members/Alternates Present: Eileen Quiring, O’Brien, Clark County Council; Julie Olson, Clark County Council; Kevin Jolma, Battle Ground School District; Doug Hood, Camas School District; Jacqui VanSoest, Green Mountain School District; Steve Marshall, Hockinson School District; Kyle Sproul, Vancouver Public Schools; Lester Brown, Washougal School District; Sharon Kruse, Washington State University – Vancouver; Mary Elkin, Vancouver Neighborhood Alliance; Bridget McLeman, Neighborhood Associations Council of Clark County; Brian Schlottmann, County Services; Mike Nerland, ESD 112; LeAnne Bremer, school district legal council

Staff, Presenters: Lindsey Hueer, Clark County Manager’s Office; Oliver Orjiako, Clark County Community Planning

Absent: Evergreen School District, La Center School District, Ridgefield School District, Woodland School District, CREDC, EOCF

1. Welcome & Introductions

April 2021 meeting notes: adopted

2. Legislation

- County Senior Policy Analyst, Lindsey Hueer, provided an update on County Council legislative priorities and opportunities for coordination and support to the school districts, including the following:
 - Council priorities include addressing sales tax leakage to Oregon; state funding for, and monitoring of, projects in the 179th St. area; and Vancouver Lake health and funding. The Council will be monitoring Growth Management Act (GMA) legislation, as it is not clear which GMA bills are most likely to move forward. There may be an opportunity to collaborate with the school districts on GMA bills.
 - The county will be resuming a grant program funded by the mental health sales tax. In the past, this has helped fund services provided in schools. School districts are encouraged to apply.
- Mike Nerland shared that a statewide legislative priority for school districts is to have a simple majority for the passage of bonds. Approximately 8-years ago the simple majority was approved for levies.
 - ESD112 is curious if the County Council has a position on this. Chair Quiring O’Brien confirmed she would need to discuss it with the rest of the Council as

it is not something they have covered.

- Mike Nerland offered to provide more information or a presentation to the County Council if of interest.
- Councilor Olson inquired about where the schools think they are at moving the needle with the legislature on the bonds issue. Mike Nerland explained that a lot of people didn't think a simple majority for levies would ever be approved, but it was. For bonds to change, it requires 2/3 of the legislature to agree and then it requires a vote of the people. The currently required 60% supermajority is a challenge for school districts in areas of high growth or high need of renovation. Councilor Olson also inquired about where the legislature stands. Mike Nerland explained the legislature is currently split.
- Steve Marshall noted that his district, Hockinson, and Camas were excluded from some of the COVID-19 relief funds that were based on free and reduced lunch rates and not on school district need. He, and likely other school districts in a similar situation, will be advocating for allocation equalization.

3. Planning Updates

- Community Planning Director, Oliver Orjiako, provided a few planning updates as follows:
 - [HB 2243](#) became law in 2017 and allows school siting in rural areas if certain requirements are met. Those requirements are outlined in [RCW 36.70A.213](#). In December 2023, the Dept. of Commerce will report to the Governor if any schools have been built under the provision. The County Council adopted ORD. 2020-03-08 to amend Clark County Code [40.370.010](#) Sewerage Regulations to allow extension of sewer to serve schools in the rural area.
 - Comprehensive Plan update: the next periodic update is due June 30, 2025. The county is waiting to begin its work once the Office of Financial Management releases their population forecast for planning purposes. These numbers are anticipated in late fall of 2022. This data also typically includes a population forecast by age that may be of interest to the school districts.
 - The county's Comprehensive Plan includes an optional Schools Chapter and the school districts may be interested in reviewing it and helping the county update it.
 - School districts also often submit their 6-year CFP and 20-year forecast as part of the plan.
- Discussion:
 - LeAnne Bremer noted the six school districts with CFP updates due in 2022 have started that work. The school facilities' analysis may include some rural sites. The districts will consider the new law and county code closely. LeAnne asked about when the 5-part test in the statute would be applied: with the CFP or a different process? Oliver explained that the county would wait to receive a development application to review its sewer requirements/new code section which also references the RCW 36.70A.213 provisions.
 - School districts would be interested in seeing the population forecast for OFM.

- When LeAnne addressed the County Council in June of 2021, on behalf of the school districts, she expressed interest in a 6-year schedule instead of a 4-year schedule for CFP updates. That is still of interest to the school districts. Oliver explained that is something the Council could consider. The tradeoff of switching to a 6-year cycle is that the impact fees are then set for 6-years instead of 4.

4. **Other**

Councilor Olson asked the school districts about interest in the mental health sales tax grants. Mike Nerland noted the school districts are seeing an increase in behavioral health issues and there is a need for more embedded mental health in schools. Councilor Olson encouraged Mike, and any of the school districts, to reach out to Lindsey to see if there is an opportunity for the county to help support that work. Lindsey noted the grant applications will open in spring of 2022, with funding available in 2023.

5. **Debrief**

The group generally agreed that this forum still seems useful with two meetings per year, with the spring focused on development updates and the fall focused on legislative priorities and opportunities for coordination and support.

6. **Next steps**

- County staff will work to schedule two meetings for 2022
- Group will next meet in Spring of 2022, exact date to be determined.

The meeting adjourned at 1:43pm.